



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/586,737 | 07/21/2006 | Ikuya Miyamoto | 1830.1024 | 1658 |
| 7590 Staas & Halsey 1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor Washington, DC 20005 | | | EXAMINER PEPITONE, MICHAEL F | |
| | | ART UNIT 1796 | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | MAIL DATE 10/01/2008 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/586,737 | MIYAMOTO ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | MICHAEL PEPITONE | 1796 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/21/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Enokida *et al.* (JP-2003261695). For the purpose of examination, the machine translation of Enokida *et al.* (JP-2003261695) was used.

Regarding claim 1: Enokida *et al.* teaches a composite material (¶ 6) comprising a sheet silicate organically modified with an onium salt (¶ 14-17) in an amount of 0.1 to 1 wt% (¶ 8); and polyethylene glycol dispersibility improvers {non-ionic surfactants} (¶ 19) in an amount of .001 to 1 wt% (¶ 20) {the ratio of silicate to surfactant overlaps the claimed range and therefore anticipates it}.

Regarding claims 2-3: Enokida *et al.* teaches dihydroxyethyl methyl octadecyl ammonium salts (¶ 16).

Regarding claims 5-7: Enokida *et al.* teaches a polylactic acid [instant claims 5-6] (¶ 7-8) biaxially oriented {stretched} film [instant claim 7] (¶ 6, 43-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokida *et al.* (JP-2003261695), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takahashi *et al.* (US 6,238,793). For the purpose of examination, the machine translation of Enokida *et al.* (JP-2003261695) was used.

Regarding claim 4: Enokida *et al.* teaches polyethylene glycol dispersibility improvers {non-ionic surfactants} (¶ 19-20).

Enokida *et al.* does not teach polyoxyethylene alkyl ethers of instant claim 4. However, Takahashi *et al.* teaches a thermoplastic composites comprising lamellar silicates (1:10-24) and non-ionic surfactants {polyethyleneglycol oleyl ether, degree of polymerization n=2~50; alkyl group = C₁₈; polyethyleneglycol lauryl ether, degree of polymerization n=2~50; alkyl group = C₁₂} (3:55-65). Enokida *et al.* and Takahashi *et al.* are analogous art because they are concerned with a similar technical difficulty, namely the preparation of thermoplastic composites comprising silicates and non-ionic surfactants. At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have combined polyethyleneglycol alkyl ethers {degree of polymerization n=2~50; alkyl group = C₁₂-C₁₈}, as taught by Takahashi *et al.* in the invention of Enokida *et al.*, and would have been motivated to do so since Takahashi *et al.* suggests that such non-ionic surfactants do not require dispersion/dissolution in media such as water (eliminating a separate process step for water removal} (3:42-51), and is an equivalent alternative means of providing preparation thermoplastic composites comprising silicates and non-ionic surfactants.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7; and 10-17 of copending Application No. 11/662197.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed polyester composites comprising layered silicates modified with hydroxyl containing onium salts, and polyoxyethylene non-ionic surfactants overlap in scope. While the instant application does not teach talc, a person having ordinary skill in the art would add a known nucleating agent {talc} to the composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure. See attached form PTO-892.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PEPITONE whose telephone number is (571)270-3299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo, Ph.D./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796
27-Sep-08

MFP
22-September-08